



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

Applicant	Rancho California Water District	County	Riverside
Project Title	Upper Santa Margarita Watershed IRWM Plan Update	Grant Request	\$ 777,050
		Total Project Cost	\$ 1,037,248

Project Description The objective of the Proposal is to prepare a comprehensive Upper Santa Margarita Watershed (USMW) IRWM Plan Update, and complete planning studies that will address the Region's key issues and support development of a standards-compliant IRWM Plan. The Region is committed to preparing an updated IRWM Plan that will guide the region's stakeholders in managing water resources for the next 20 years. The USMW IRWM planning process allows stakeholders to examine the entire suite of potential solutions to key issues, including improved water supply reliability, protection and improvement of water quality, environmental stewardship, and integrated flood management. Ultimately, the USMW IRWM program provides the region with a new foundation and opportunity for resolving long-standing historical water conflicts and issues.

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	12
DAC Involvement	10
Schedule	4
Budget	6
Program Preferences	5
Tie Breaker	0
Total Score	37

- **Work Plan** This criterion is fully addressed but not supported by thorough documentation and logical rationale. The proposal describes additional content that will be added to address each of the IRWM plan standards as well as integration of the results of three planning studies contained in the proposal into the IRWM Plan update. However, the process by which the plan standards will be generated – including the resources used, resources consulted, or input considered during the development of the draft – is not clear. Much of the work involves data collection studies (Task 2), with some incorporation of study results into one or more IRWM plan standards, but in general, there is little detail presented in Task 3 (IRWM Plan Update) on the scope of the work that will be performed to meet all IRWM plan standards.
- **DAC Involvement** This criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation. DACs occupy more than one-third of the geographical area of the region and are crucial to the planning efforts. The applicant lays out specific activities to reach out to DACs and tribal communities to enhance their engagement and sustain active participation in the planning process. DACs seem to be involved in the RWMG, and the RWMG is taking steps to collect data to fill the data gaps in the DAC areas. One of the planning studies is dedicated to the DAC in the Anza area, the results of which will be incorporated into an update of several plan standards. Additional outreach tasks described in task 1-6 are proposed to sustain engagement of DACs more generally throughout the region.
- **Schedule** This criterion is fully addressed but not supported by thorough documentation and logical rationale. The Schedule is consistent with the Work Plan and Budget. One proposed Special Study will be completed prior to the assumed effective date of the grant agreement, while the rest of the work to complete updating the IRWM Plan is scheduled to occur within two years after this date. Little narrative



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

was supplied to substantiate the schedule, and numerous question marks accompanying task durations shown in the Schedule seems to suggest uncertainty about the actual length of time required for these tasks.

- **Budget** This criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The budget is consistent with the Work Plan and Schedule. However, a lump sum estimate is provided for Task 4 “Grant Administration” without a justification for why a lump sum estimate is adequate or reasonable; the breakdown for various activities under the task—which includes the costs of managing the contract, preparing progress reports, and documenting project performance—is not provided. Cost share for Task 2-3 “Regional Retrofit Opportunities Study” is given as four lump-sum amounts for consultant services, but without information of bill rates and number of hours. Instead, the applicant provides reference to an Exhibit A of Attachment 4 for this information. However, Exhibit A is appended to the back of the Attachment 3 Work Plan, and does not describe the retrofit study but rather a different study co-funded by DWR; thus a basis for the \$70,495 is not provided. The narrative (pg 11) describes a total of 46 meetings that the Director of Planning will attend and for which cost share is contributed, but the Budget Table 4-4 shows only 42 meetings.
- **Program Preference** The application sufficiently demonstrates that 12 of 15 Program Preferences will be met.
- **Tie Breaker** Not Applicable.